REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance for the above-identified patent application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-13, 15-20, 22, and 23 remain pending.

Initially, Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's withdrawal of the finality and the previous rejections in the prior Office action.

The current Office action rejects the pending claims under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,212,565 to Gupta (*"Gupta"*) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0016839 A1 to Smith et al. (*"Smith"*) and further in view of U.S. Application Publication No. 2003/0219029 to Picket (*"Picket"*).[1] This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously noted, the present invention provides for an HTTP-based, reliable messaging protocol that enables bi-directional reliable messaging through a web proxy. In a particular embodiment, the various independent claims enable the bi-directional messaging by providing HTTP-based "requests", which are parked at a server and include a request that the server send a reply after a specified period of time. This will ensure that the client's proxy server will not time out and close the connection due to inactivity on the channel.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art of record does not render the present claims unpatentable for at least the reason that the alleged prior art does not disclose or suggest each and every element of Applicant's independent claims. For example, the cited art does not disclose or suggest "wherein an HTTP-based 'request' includes therein a request that a processor transmits a reply after the expiration of a time period even if there are no messages to send to a first processor," as generally claimed within the independent claims

As noted in the Office action, the combination of *Gupta* and *Smith* does not disclose or suggest the feature of "wherein an HTTP-based 'request' includes therein a request that a processor transmits a reply after the expiration of a time period even if there are no messages to send to a first processor." Accordingly, the Office action now cites *Picket* as allegedly disclosing this feature.

Picket discloses systems and methods for multiple mode voice and data communications using intelligently bridged TDM and packet buses and methods for performing telephony and

data functions using the same. Although *Picket* describes using HTTP protocol for remotely administering, configuring, and diagnosing a communication system, *Picket* is silent with regards to "parking" an HTTP request. As such, *Picket* cannot possibly rectify those deficiencies noted above with regard to *Gupta* and *Smith*. Nevertheless, the Office action cites paragraphs [0164]-[0166] of *Picket* as allegedly disclosing the feature of "wherein an HTTP-based 'request' includes therein a request that a processor transmits a reply after the expiration of a time period even if there are no messages to send to a first processor." Applicant respectfully notes that this cited section of *Picket* describes various techniques and configuration parameters for holding and answering incoming telephone calls. Such telephone calls, however, cannot possibly disclose or suggest an HTTP-based request. In addition, although *Picket* does disclose mechanisms for determining the length at which a call can be placed on hold, *Picket* does not disclose or suggest that the incoming call itself includes a timeout request. As such, *Picket* cannot possibly disclose or suggest "wherein an HTTP-based 'request' includes therein a request that a processor transmits a reply after the expiration of a time period even if there are no messages to send to a first processor," as recited in the independent claims.

Because the cited art does not disclose or suggest each and every element of Applicant's independent claims, this cited art does not render the present application unpatentable.

Based on at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited prior art fails to anticipate or otherwise make obvious Applicant's invention as claimed for example, in independent claims 1, 13, and 20. Applicant notes for the record that the remarks above render the remaining rejections of record for the independent and dependent claims moot, and thus addressing individual rejections or assertions with respect to the teachings of the cited art is unnecessary at the present time, but may be undertaken in the future if necessary or desirable and Applicant reserves the right to do so.

---

[1] Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Should any questions arise in conjunction with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at 1-801-533-9800.

DATED this 2nd day of January, 2007.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Wesley C. Rosander, Reg.# 51,030/
Wesley C. Rosander

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
WESLEY C. ROSANDER
Registration No. 51,030
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 047973

WCR:sa
W:\13768\604.7\SDA0000004195V001.DOC